

**Los Angeles Contaminated Sediments Task Force
Confined Aquatic Disposal Site Long-Term Monitoring Program
Request for Proposals
Bidders Meeting
July 8, 2002**

Held at the Offices of the Southern California Coastal Water Research Project
7171 Fenwick Lane
Westminster, CA 92683

In Attendance:

David Moore, MEC Analytical, Inc. (moore@mecanalytical.com)
Nicole Apel, MEC Analytical, Inc. (apel@mecanalytical.com)
Nick Buhbe, AMEC Earth and Environmental (Nicholas.buhbe@amec.com)
Mike Curtis, MBC Applied Environmental (mcurtis@mbcnet.net)
Tim Mikel, Aquatic Bioassay Labs. (tkmikel@pacbell.net)

Other individuals submitting letters of interest but not present:

Ned Laman, Tenera Environmental (nlaman@tenera.com)
Jay Carroll, Tenera Environmental (jcarroll@tenera.com) Charles Gossett,
CRG Marine Labs, Inc. (crglabs@hotmail.com)
Pat Kinney, Kinnetic Labs, Inc. (pkinney@kinneticlabs.com)

Response to Bidders Questions

Q: Are the cap and dredged material layers clearly visible in a core tube?

A: Yes, the two layers differ in color.

Q: How will the benthic community data be used in this study, for assessment of CAD success or as supplemental information?

A: The benthos data will be used to supplement our understanding of the rate of recolonization of the cap and to indicate what types of bioturbators are present.

Q: The RFP indicates a July-September sampling time frame, is that feasible for the first year considering the requirement to have an approved QAPP,

A: It is likely that the first year's sampling may not occur until October, due to the need to review proposals, establish a contract, and approve the QAPP. The ability of the company to rapidly mobilize and sample soon after the award of the contract will be viewed favorably during the proposal review process.

Q: A resolution of 0.1 m for the bathymetric surveys is specified in the RFP, will this be sufficient to resolve changes in the cap, which has a thickness of 1-1.5 m? Perhaps better technology should be used.

A: A resolution of 0.1 m was identified as acceptable by the CSTF and represents a realistic value for work of this type. The proposal should achieve this level of precision, more precise measurements are also acceptable but will not necessarily be given preference during review of the bids.

Q: Where should the 10 benthos reference stations be located?

A: These stations should be located within the borrow pit, but outside of the CAD area. It is acknowledged that these sites will likely have a different grain size than those from the CAD site.

Q: How will the 10% retention of payments to the contractor be handled?

A: This retention applies to the final cost of the project. Thus, the full amount of the qualifying expenses of the contractor's invoice will be paid up until 90% of the project cost. The remainder will be retained until the project is completed.

Q: What size should the diver-deployed cores be?

A: That is up to the contractor. The main requirements are that the core material not contaminate the sample, be transparent, and be large enough in diameter to provide enough sediment to achieve the intended reporting limits in less than a 6 inch sample interval.

Questions received after the bidder's meeting:

Q: Figure 4 indicates that chemistry analyses will be conducted at 5 core stations, yet the text indicates that all 9 stations will be analyzed. Which is correct?

A. The text is correct, sediment from all nine stations will be analyzed for chemical constituents.

Q: It may be difficult for a diver to successfully core to the depth of >4 feet needed for this study, can an alternate coring method be used?

A: You should base your cost proposal on using diver-deployed cores. If you feel that a different method is better for this study, please discuss this in your proposal. If an alternate method is approved for use in the study, the cost for this activity will be reevaluated.

Q: The MDLs listed in Table 1 are pretty low, are they required? Are these values method detection limits or reporting limits?

A: The list of sediment constituents (Table 1) has been revised to address questions about reporting limits. Note that the table now lists reporting limits, instead of MDLs, and that the values may differ from what has been distributed previously. Please use the revised values in calculating your bid.

Q: Is NELAP certification of the analytical lab required?

A: No. NELAP certification is an example of the type of documentation of the lab's capabilities that is desired, but other types of information are acceptable. Lab performance data for the constituents listed in Table 1 and for marine sediments are of greatest relevance for this project.

Q: Smearing of the outer surface core may interfere with the visual determination of the cap and LARE sediment layers. Should the core be split lengthwise for visual assessment instead?

A: Plan on using the outer appearance of the core to tentatively define the layers, as the LARE sediment may be too soft to permit splitting of the core. This approach may need to be revised at the time of core extrusion.

Table 1 (**Revised**). Sediment constituents (and reporting limits) to be measured in core and grab samples.

Metals	Reporting Limit ug/g dry wt	PAHs	Reporting Limit ng/g dry wt
Aluminum	1,000	<i>MDL = 5 (ng/g dry wt.)</i>	=20
Antimony	0.2	Acenaphthene	=20
Arsenic	1.0	Acenaphthylene	=20
Barium	1.0	Anthracene	=20
Beryllium	0.2	Benz[a]anthracene	=20
Cadmium	0.2	Benzo[a]pyrene	=20
Chromium	10	Benzo[b]fluoranthene	=20
Copper	1.0	Benzo[e]pyrene	=20
Iron	1,000	Benzo[g,h,i]perylene	=50
Lead	1.0	Benzo[k]fluoranthene	=20
Mercury	0.03	Biphenyl	=20
Nickel	10	Chrysene	=20
Selenium	0.1	Dibenz[a,h]anthracene	=50
Silver	0.02	Fluoranthene	=20
Zinc	10	Fluorene	=20
		Indeno(1,2,3-c,d)pyrene	=50
		Naphthalene	=20
		Perylene	=20
		Phenanthrene	=20
		Pyrene	=20
		2,6-Dimethylnaphthalene	=20
General Constituents		1-Methylnaphthalene	=20
Sediment grain size		2-Methylnaphthalene	=20
Total organic carbon	0.1 %	1-Methylphenanthrene	=20
Moisture		1,6,7-Trimethylnaphthalene	=20
Density			